The Address-Mr. B. Loiselle

Mr. Speaker, in the economic field, I think that this government acted as a responsible and truly liberal government, because while we undertook some reforms, remedial action and adjustment programs, we always kept in mind that, being Liberals, we must always make sure that our resources will be honestly and equitably redistributed amongst all Canadians, and not in the manner described in the Mortgage Follies article published in the Globe and Mail of October 3, 1978, dealing with the mortgage program proposed by the Progressive Conservative party. If the Conservative members want to talk about the redistribution of wealth, I am prepared to answer any of their questions after my speech, and I will probably be able to teach them something on this matter. Even in your own province, there would be room for a better redistribution of wealth, for I know western Canada better than you know Quebec.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Like Mr. Horner!

Mr. Loiselle (Chambly): Yes, Crowfoot is a constituency I know well; in fact, I like both the riding and the minister. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Liberal party can be proud, and its members can carry their head high. The Liberal party holds a record in the economic field which few other governments, amongst our neighbours, amongst industrialized countries, may boast of. This is evidenced by the fact that with a population of 23 million and a country like ours, we have been able to achieve the performances which are reflected in the statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to deal with the constitutional issue, one which of course is at the centre of all discussions in the three-day period we are living now, the first day having ended at about six o'clock. Like most Canadians, I listened to the first reports of commentators and political experts who analysed the first day of discussions of the federal-provincial conference on the future of Canada and on the constitutional changes.

I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little confused because I had to go by those reports because I was unable to listen to the speeches of all the provincial premiers. From bits and pieces of speeches and reports, especially those by Englishspeaking commentators, I had the impression that the Prime Minister had behaved like a perfect jackass throughout the day, that he had lacked leadership. But when we turned to the French channel, we heard someone say that the Prime Minister had been outstanding. So I think we will have to wait for the eleven o'clock news to have the story from both sides. However, from the little I have heard about what has been said today, one question comes to my mind: we had, gathered in this forum, the ten provincial premiers and the federal Prime Minister, that is the eleven Canadians who are or should be the most experienced men on matters related to the future, the possibilities and the constitutional changes to be made in this country.

Mr. Speaker, after witnessing the conduct of some, after listening to interviews given by some premiers, I wonder if they

realize that half of a country rests on the common will of its citizens and depends first and foremost on the choice of people of any language and culture to bring together their diversity, their skills, their heart and soul to live as a nation. The other half, Mr. Speaker, rests of course on economic and geographic reasons and one can prove, depending on the time and place, that reasons which were relevant ten years ago on economic grounds are less so today. But, Mr. Speaker, one thing that does not and will not change in any country of the world is the common desire to have a country and that desire is lacking in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when one sees provincial premiers getting prepared for a conference in Regina to stonewall the federal government, one with natural resources, one with tariffs, another with off-shore resources and yet another using who knows what else, so they all say, like the Conservative leader, that they have come to a consensus, that they are all mad as hell. That Mr. Speaker, is the easiest thing to do. The problem is to arrive at some common denominator. The people from Alberta who are sitting here, my new friends whom I have learned to know since becoming a member of this House, there was a time when they needed the resources from the east to develop. Now it is us easterners who are asking them to show some heart and reason and help our economy. Indeed tomorrow if the wells dry up, they will have to live off their industrial development. Even the newly elected economists on the other side will not be able to deny such an obvious thruth.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not in this country define once and for all our willingness and reason for our staying together, or if we follow the Tory leader's philosophy and strip away most of the federal government's power, then I prefer being a separatist Ouebecker. Because the day the federal government becomes a dead weight, Tory style—. What do you want, we might as well be Quebeckers, Ontarians, and westerners above all else. We will meet from time to time at the Calgary Stampede, but we will look after our own business. We would not thus take advantage of the benefit of the whole community because the country was made up of people who once shared common ideals, ideals of freedom and greatness throughout Canada, Mr. Speaker, ideals to build a country which would be envied by all humanists in the world. That challenge has been taken up by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who has been trying to explain it to us for the past ten years, but we refuse to budge. It would be more embarrassing to pass a bill of rights which would compel Canadians to show some openmindedness. Would it be more annoying for a premier of British Columbia who would not be much embarrassed if suddenly his fellow citizens wanted to vote against him as a result of the bill of rights? It would be better to restrict ourselves to a provincial charter as suggested by our premier, Mr. Lévesque, but at least we know why he says so while we are not so sure about the others. However, Mr. Speaker, rather than enforce a bill of rights which would be included in that constitution as it is in most countries, we say: Let us have